

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-22, 24-37, and 39-42 are currently pending in the subject application, claims 1, 3-22, 24-25, 36-37, and 39-40 are presently under consideration, and claims 26-35 and 41-42 have been withdrawn. A version of all pending claims is presented at pp. 2-9. Claims 21 and 36 have been amended herein to address the Examiner's recent objection. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection of Claims 1, 21 and 36

Claims 1, 21 and 36 are objected to because of minor informalities. In view of the amendments to claims 21 and 36, this objection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 7-16, 18-22, 24-25, 36, 37, 39 and 40 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-16, 18-22, 24, 25, 36, 37, 39 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Domensikos *et al.* (US 6,065,043) in view of Murphy *et al.* (US 6,096,096). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. The cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, *the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.* See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not based on the applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (emphasis added).

The claimed invention relates to a client side caching infrastructure that facilitates seamless operation across connectivity states between computers across a network. In particular, independent claim 1 recites a remote file system, comprising one or more surrogate providers comprising at least a first surrogate provider that is a client side caching component that selectively caches at least a subset of data from at least one online server and supports connection state transitions at the directory level on a logical namespace; and one or more client computers that receive and store the subset of data to their respective local databases for offline use by the respective client computers to facilitate a seamless operation of data retrieval across connectivity states for a user, ***the offline use is limited to shares of the logical namespace that are experiencing a period of disconnect***. Independent claims 21 and 36 recite similar limitations. Domensikos *et al.* and Murphy *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest such novel features recited in the subject claims.

Domensikos *et al.* allows client computers to connect to a server of an Internet site and execute applications stored on a memory device linked to the server. However, at page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Domensikos *et al.* is silent regarding one or more client computers that receive and store the subset of data to facilitate a seamless operation of data retrieval across connectivity states for a user, ***the offline use is limited to shares of the logical namespace that are experiencing a period of disconnect*** as afforded by the claimed invention.

The Examiner attempts to compensate for the aforementioned deficiencies of Domensikos *et al.* with Murphy *et al.* Murphy *et al.* teaches emulating online access of information in an off-line environment. At page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Murphy teaches a system where the offline client is configured to cache only the shares of the logical namespace that are experiencing a period of disconnect, as afforded by the claimed invention - applicants' representative respectfully disagrees. At the indicated portions, the reference discloses storing information from an entire web site onto a portable storage medium. The stored information includes all documents linked to the website and corresponding virtual document roots. However, nowhere does the reference limit offline data access to only specific shares of a single logical namespace that are experiencing a period of disconnect. Rather, Murphy *et al.* provides a system for navigating an entire website while offline without contemplating allowing online access to shares of a logical namespace that are not experiencing

a period of disconnect and limiting offline access of data associated with *shares of the logical namespace that are experiencing a period of disconnect*, as in the claimed invention. In particular, for example, if only one share of a logical namespace is experiencing a period of disconnect, Murphy *et al.* does not teach or suggest that offline use is restricted to this one offline share of the namespace while the remaining shares of the namespace that are not experiencing a period of disconnect are still accessed online by a user. Rather, the cited reference stores the entire contents of the website on a storage medium for subsequent offline access. Consequently, Murphy *et al.* is silent regarding one or more client computers that receive and store the subset of data to their respective local databases for offline use by the respective client computers to facilitate a seamless operation of data retrieval across connectivity states for a user, the offline use *limited to shares of the logical namespace that are experiencing a period of disconnect* as recited in independent claims 1, 21 and 36.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Domensikos *et al.* and Murphy *et al.*, considered individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all aspects of the subject claims. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 6 and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Domensikos *et al.* of record in view of Murphy *et al.* and further in view of Shaw *et al.* (US 2002/0083148). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. The subject claims depend from independent claim 1. As discussed *supra*, Domensikos *et al.* and Murphy *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in claim 1. Shaw *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Domensikos *et al.* and Murphy *et al.* Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP527US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731